DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 129 SP 004 710

AUTHOR Watson, Elizabeth P.; And Others
TITLE Interrelations of Student-Teacher Agreement of Classroom Expectations and Behavior, Program Innovations and Student Satisfaction.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 14p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication, *Conventional Instruction, *Expectation, *Instructional Innovation, Role Perception, Secondary School Students, Secondary School Teachers, Student Attitudes, Student Behavior, Student Role, *Student Teacher Relationship
IDENTIFIERS WAS, Watson Analysis Schedule

ABSTRACT

A study investigated the magnitude and direction of the congruence of communicated expectations for teachers and students in innovative and conventional programs. The three-part Watson Analysis Schedule (WAS) which measures explicit, actual, and realized expectations was administered to 525 students and teachers in American studies classes ("process-oriented") and to 1,207 students and teachers in conventional American history classes ("content-oriented"). The degree of congruence between the responses of teachers and students within programs was determined by use of zero-order correlation coefficients for each of the three parts of the WAS, and differences between programs were analyzed by comparing the respective indices of relation using Fisher z transformations. In the same manner congruence was determined for responses between the parts for the students and for the teachers in each program. Generally there was higher congruence between students and teachers in conventional than innovative programs although statistics support neither a strong positive nor negative relation. Implications are that satisfaction is more highly dependent on the nature of the students' role within a program than on the efficiency with which expectations are communicated. (Complete findings are included plus an eight-item bibliography.) (JS)

ED052129

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTERRELATIONS OF STUDENT-TEACHER AGREEMENT OF CLASSROOM EXPECTATIONS AND BEHAVIOR, PROGRAM INNOVATIVENESS AND STUDENT SATISFACTION

Elizabeth P. Watson
University of Missouri-
St. Louis

Jon C. Marshall
University of Missouri-
St. Louis

Alvin P. Sokol
University City (Mo.)
School District

Introduction

The direction of current innovations in the curriculum is toward a process oriented position (Berman, 1968). In general the nature of the innovations is a deviation from the conventional content position in terms of changes in curricula teaching strategies and administrative organization, based on an acceptance of different instructional goals (Hunt and Metcalfe, 1968).

When the statements from the separate disciplines of learning theory, role theory, and communications theory are arrayed in close proximity, it becomes possible to note certain consistencies among them (Broom and Selznick, 1955; Getzels and Thelen, 1960; Snygg, 1966). All of them reflect a similar conceptual framework, albeit from separate vantage points. They seem to emphasize that in a learning situation, (1) the teacher and the students bring internalized sets into the situation, (2) either implicitly or explicitly, the teacher formulates and communicates goals to the students, (3) the student's perception of this communication defines, for the student, his role expectation, and (4) the student's acceptance or rejection of the communicated role expectation defines his subsequent behavior. In this conceptualization, the teacher and the pupils are both reacting to messages sent from the teacher in terms of their respective internalized schemas. There are numerous aspects of these messages. One of these which would logically relate to role definition would be the communicated expectations of the teachers and the student's perception of these expectations.

It has been suggested by role theorists that the efficiency of the communi-

SP004710

cation between sender (teacher) and receiver (student) is a basic determinant of the *quality* of the learning situation (*i.e.*, interest and satisfaction of the student). This efficiency might logically be determined by examining the congruence of the perceptions of the teacher and the students toward the content of the communicated message.

Thus, it would be of interest to examine this efficiency of communication in terms of the congruence of expectations as perceived by students and teachers. Of particular concern is the possibility of innovations detrementally confusing students' through a shift in expectations since such incongruence has been assumed to be correlated with dissatisfaction and frustration.

Purpose

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the magnitude and direction of the congruence of communicated expectations for teachers and students in innovative and conventional programs. For the purposes of this study, the communications were divided into the following three categories: (1) explicitly stated expectations, (2) actual expectations, and (3) realized expectations.

Method

The general plan for this study was to obtain selected measurements on students' and teachers' perceptions of learning behavior for students enrolled in innovative and conventional programs.

The measurement instrument used for this investigation was the Watson Analysis Schedule, Form A (WAS in Marshall and Sokol, 1968; Watson 1969). The schedule is divided into three parts with each part containing the same 71 items but consisting of different directions for responding to the items.

Part I (Explicit Expectations) Students are asked to indicate expectations stated by the teacher.

Part II (Actual Expectations) Students are asked to indicate expectations which they perceive as actually held by the teacher.

Part III (Realized Expectations) Students are asked to indicate expectations which are actually operative.

Student responses to each item ranged from very sure the statement is true to very sure the statement is not true on a five point scale.

In a previously reported study an innovative American Studies program and two conventional American History programs had been documented as "process-oriented" and "content-oriented" respectively (Watson, Marshall and Sokol, In press). These programs were the source of data collected for this study.

The sample consisted of the students and teachers in American Studies classes and conventional American history classes. The students and teachers in the American Studies program were denoted the experimental group (Ep). The comparison groups consisted of students and teachers from two school districts in the same metropolitan area which ranked closest to the school housing the innovative program on the basis of 16 variables.* These groups were the control sample (denoted C1 and C2). The total enrollment in the three programs were 525, 550, and 657, for Ep, C1, and C2, respectively.

In the present study the analyses utilized all 29 ($n_{Ep} = 12$, $n_{C1} = 8$, $n_{C2} = 9$) teachers and the total student population in each of the three programs.

Results

This study was designed to analyze several questions raised concerning the innovative and conventional programs. These questions related specifically to

---

* These variables included statistics related to finance, college potential of students, teacher academic background and teacher experience (Watson, 1969).

the efficiency of communication between teacher and student.

Congruence, as defined for this study, was the degree of relation between explicit - actual; explicit - realized; and actual - realized expectations as perceived by both teachers and students, separately, and by their interaction on each dimension. *Efficiency of communication* was defined as the congruence between students and teachers of explicit and actual expectations. As thus defined, efficiency of communication was a subset of congruence.

The degree of congruence between the responses of teachers and students within programs was determined by use of Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients for each of the three parts of the WAS.

The expected values for both teachers and students in each of the groups, Ep, C1, and C2, were determined for each of the 213 items on the inventory. The correlation coefficients represent the degrees of relation between students and teachers, within a group, on the 71 items comprising each part of the inventory (see Table 1). The results are schematically presented in Figure 1.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

Differences between programs were analyzed by comparing the respective indices of relation for Ep *versus* C1, Ep *versus* C2, and C1 *versus* C2, using Fisher z transformations. All differences were found to be significant at the .05 level of confidence.

It can be noted that students and teachers in the Experimental program did not agree on the explicit or actual expectations and, thus, indicated an extreme lack of efficiency in the communication of specific expectations. However, there was a

.501 correlation between students and teachers associated with their perception of realized expectations or the actual behavior of the students. In comparison, greater congruence between students and teachers for actual expectations (greater efficiency of communication) was found in both of the control groups while the perception of the students' actual behavior or realized expectations yielded less congruence than Ep, and, in the case of C2, a negative relation.

In the same manner, congruence was determined for responses between the parts taken two at a time for the students within each program. These correlation coefficients are presented in Table 1. These results are also presented graphically in Figure 2. All differences between programs were statistically significant at the .05 level.

FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

As might be expected there were high correlations between students' responses on Parts I and II of the WAS. These represented Explicit and Actual expectations. However, for all three student groups the highest correlations can be observed between Parts II and III. These correlations represent the congruence of students' perception of what they are actually expected to do and what they actually do. As represented in Figure 2, the groups were again relatively homogeneous although the differences between groups were statistically significant. Here the relative positions of the groups remained the same for all three comparisons with Ep representing the lesser degree of congruence between parts and C2 the greater degree of congruence.

The congruences for responses between the parts taken two at a time for teachers were analyzed in the same manner as for the students (see Table 1). These results are presented graphically in Figure 3.

FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

A relatively high degree of consistency was indicated for all teacher responses for Parts I and II, Explicit and Actual Expectations. Less consistency was found for the other comparisons for teachers between parts. Of particular note was the strong negative correlations between Part I, Explicit Expectations and Part III, Realized Expectations for the teachers in the Experimental group. Although the difference was not as strong, it can also be seen in the Experimental teachers' perception of the relation between Part II, Actual Expectations, and Part III, Realized Expectations.

A second interesting relation is found in the statistics for C2, the most teacher-oriented group (see Sokol and Marshall, 1968). Teachers' responses of their perception of what students are actually expected to do and what they actually do were highly positively correlated. As can be noted in Table 1, students' responses on these two parts were also highly positively correlated. Yet the data further indicated that for C2 there was a negative correlation between the students' perception of their actual behavior and the teachers' perception of the students' behavior. That is, even though the students in this program saw themselves doing what they were expected to do and the teachers saw the students doing what they actually expect the students to do, the teachers and students were in *disagreement* as to what the students were actually doing.

When the correlations of the teachers' responses between parts were compared among the three programs they were found to be significantly different at the .05 level. Homogeneity among programs was still observable in Figure 3 for Parts I and II. However, this was not evident for Parts I and III or Parts II and III.

Discussion

As stated previously, efficiency of communication might be determined on the basis of the congruence data by noting the correlation between teachers and students on Part I or Part II. Although previous research has suggested a possible discrepancy between Explicit and Actual expectations there was no evidence of such a discrepancy in these data. In fact a high degree of relation was attained for the Explicit and Actual expectations for students and teachers in each of the three programs.

The results of the congruence data *would not indicate* efficiency of communication of *specific* expectations. Yet, it would appear from the factor analyses data in the initial study (Watson, Marshall, Sokol, In Press) that there is efficient communication of *generalized* role orientations.

Generally, there appears to be higher congruence between students and teachers in both of the Control groups than for those in the Experimental group. However, the statistics do not appear to support either a *strongly* positive or negative relation. Conversely, the original factor results (Watson, Marshall, Sokol, In Press) for teachers and students in the Experimental group indicated a high consistency of role orientation.

The negative relation between teacher and student perceptions might appear, taken by itself, to argue for lack of communication in the innovative program. However, placing these data in the perspective of those presented in the previously reported study (Watson, Marshall, Sokol, In Press) another possible interpretation emerges. The factor data from the initial study indicated that the Ep teachers were committed to the process orientation and that this orientation and the concomitant general expectations were communicated. Furthermore, the behavior of the students, according to the report of both student and teacher groups, diverged

from the conventional practices found in the two conventional groups. The previous two points, then, indicate that, although consistency can be observed in the general change in program orientation, change in terms of *specific behaviors* of students (role definition) has not - in the perceptions of the teachers - occurred to the degree which they would seem to desire.

This conjecture would seem to be supported by evidence on the relations noted for student-teacher congruence. As was previously pointed out in the presentation of the findings, there was a lack of efficiency for the communication of specific expectations, particularly for the Ep group as compared with the conventional groups. However, a noteworthy reversal in this relation emerged when comparing the groups in terms of realized expectations. This would seem to indicate that, even though the communication of specific expectations from the Ep teachers to their students is diffuse, as compared to the conventional teachers, they *are more sensitive* to the actual behaviors of the students in their program.

As might be expected from the nature of a program emphasizing student involvement in the learning process, the efficiency of communication of individual expectations is less than in the conventional programs. However, contradictory to the theoretical construct of roles and communication, it would appear that it is erroneous to assume that such lack of congruence is detrimental to the translation of a general goal orientation into actual behavior, or that it detracts from satisfaction with a program. It appears equally erroneous to assume that congruence of expectations *per se* leads to satisfaction even when the expectations are perceived by the participants as being realized. This is borne out by the fact that for the program demonstrating the greatest degree of congruence of expectations (C2) the students indicated on the WAS that they *did not enjoy* the activities of the program, and that for the program demonstrating the least degree of congruence

of expectations (Ep), the students indicated that they *did enjoy* the activities of the program.

These data suggest that satisfaction is more highly dependent on the nature of the students' role within a program than on the efficiency with which expectations are communicated.

References

Berman, Louise M. New Priorities in the Curriculum. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus, Ohio, 1968.

Broom, Leonard, and Selznick, Phillip. Sociology. Row, Peterson and Company, Evanston, Illinois, 1955.

Getzels, Jacob W., and Thelen, Herbert A., "The Classroom as a Unique Social System," in The Dynamics of Instructional Groups, edited by Nelson B. Henry, Fifty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part 2, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1960, pp. 53-82.

Hunt, Maurice P. and Metcalf, Laurence E. Teaching High School Social Studies. Harper and Row, Publishers, Evanston, 1968.

Snygg, Donald. "A Cognitive Field Theory of Learning." In Learning and Mental Health in the Schools. Walter B. Waetjen and Robert R. Leeper (eds.), Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), Washington, D.C., 1966, pp. 77-96.

Sokol, Alvin P. and Marshall, Jon C. Inquiry Into Innovations. School District of University City: University City, Missouri, 1968, pp. 33-145.

Watson, Elizabeth P., Marshall, Jon C. and Sokol, Alvin P. "Students' Role Expectations as Perceived by Teachers and Students in American Studies and American History Programs," Educational Leadership, in press.

Watson, Elizabeth P., Inventoried Perceptions of Expectations for Students in Three Different Social Studies Programs, unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1969.

TABLE 1

Correlations of WAS Responses

Program	Group(s)	Parts* I	Parts* II	Parts* III
Ep	Teacher vs. Student	-.167	+.051	+.501
C1	Teacher vs. Student	-.355	+.310	+.425
C2	Teacher vs. Student	+.162	+.416	-.270
		I and II	I and III	II and III
Ep	Students	+.592	+.486	+.750
C1	Students	+.706	+.631	+.806
C2	Students	+.754	+.692	+.856
Ep	Teachers	+.680	-.718	-.237
C1	Teachers	+.555	+.207	+.156
C2	Teachers	+.715	+.453	+.707

*Using Fisher a, with SE = .0294, the differences in correlations between groups Ep-C1, Ep-C2, and C1-C2 were all significant at the .05 level.

Part	Line Graph of Correlation Coefficients
I Explicit	Cl Ep C2
	-1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00
II Actual	Ep Cl C2
	-1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00
III Realized	C2 Cl Ep
	-1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00

Figure 1. Graphic illustration of congruence between students and teachers for Ep, Cl, and C2.

Parts	Line Graph of Correlation Cofficients
Explicit and Actual	-1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00 (Ep C1 C2)
Explicit and Realized	-1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00 (Ep C1 C2)
Actual and Realized	-1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00 (Ep C1 C2)

Figure 2. Graphic illustration of congruence of students among the three parts of the WAS for Ep, C1, and C2.

Parts	Line Graph of Correlation Coefficients
Explicit and Actual	C1 Ep C2 -1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00
Explicit and Realized	Ep C1 C2 -1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00
Actual and Realized	Ep C1 C2 -1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00

Figure 3. Graphic illustration of congruence of teachers for Ep, C1, and C2 between the three parts of the WAS.